arXiv:0909.0873v1 [physics.chem-ph] 4 Sep 2009

Nonadiabatic Calculation of Dipole Moments

Francisco M. Fernández and Julián Echave

INIFTA (UNLP, CCT La Plata-CONICET),

Diag. 113 y 64 (S/N), Sucursal 4, Casilla de Correo 16,

1900 La Plata, Argentina

e–mail: fernande@quimica.unlp.edu.ar, jechave@inifta.unlp.edu.ar

September 4, 2009

Abstract

We review some of the few available nonadiabatic calculations of dipole moments. We show that those carried out in a laboratory–fixed set of coordinate axes are bound to fail and discuss the more reasonable ones in a molecule–fixed reference frame. For completeness we also describe the standard Born–Oppenheimer calculations of dipole moments. We briefly address the experimental estimation of dipole moments from the Stark shift of spectral lines and argue that it does not provide such property but a sort of energy–weighted average of dipole transition moments.

1 Introduction

Many properties of molecular aggregates are attributed to the distribution of charges in the constituent individual molecules or what is commonly called the molecular dipole moment. This molecular property is also responsible of the most salient features of the absorption and emission spectra of molecules [1–3]. Molecular dipole moments can be obtained, for example, from microwave spectra [1–3], or calculated from first principles [4].

The purpose of this review is to outline the calculation of molecular dipole moments by means of quantum–mechanical approaches and compare such theoretical results with corresponding experimental measurements. It is not expected to be exhaustive because of the enormous number of worthy works on the subject. However, we hope to succeed in giving an idea of the difficulties encountered in such endeavour.

In Sec. 2 we consider the nonrelativistic molecular Hamiltonian and discuss the separation of the center of mass in detail. We derive general expressions that may be useful for most of the various nonadiabatic approaches that appear in the current literature. In Sec. 3 we outline the dynamical symmetry of the molecular Hamiltonian and some of the properties of the molecular stationary states. In Sec. 4 we discuss the well–known Hellmann–Feynman theorem for variational wavefunctions because it is relevant to the calculation of dipole moments. Although we are mainly interested in nonadiabatic calculations of dipole moments, in Sec. 5 we consider the separation of the electronic and nuclear motions that leads to the Born–Oppenheimer and adiabatic approaches to the calculation of molecular properties. For completeness, in Sec. 6 we outline the interaction between a system of point

charges and an external electric field with the purpose of defining dipole moment, polarizabilities and other molecular properties. In Sec. 7 we briefly describe the models used to derive the dipole moment from the Stark effect in rotational spectra. They will be useful for comparison between experimental measurements and theoretical calculations. In Sec. 8 we briefly review the theoretical calculation of molecular dipole moments under the Born–Oppenheimer approximation. In Sec. 9 we discuss some of the existing nonadiabatic calculations of dipole moments which is the main topic of this review. In Sec. 10 we briefly describe the more rigorous nonadiabatic calculations of dipole moments in the molecule–fixed reference frame. For simplicity we restrict ourselves to diatomic molecules because they appear to be the only ones accessible to current nonadiabatic approaches. In Sec. 11 we outline the application of perturbation theory to the Schrödinger equation for a molecule in an external electric field with the purpose of discussing a more rigorous connection between the measured Stark shift and the molecular dipole moment. Finally, in Sec. 12 we summarize the main conclusions of this review.

2 The molecular Hamiltonian

In this section we consider the nonrelativistic molecular Hamiltonian as a system of N charged point particles with only Coulomb interactions

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= \hat{T} + \hat{V}, \\ \hat{T} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\hat{p}_i^2}{2m_i}, \\ V &= \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \frac{q_i q_j}{r_{ij}} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In this expression m_i is the mass of particle i, $q_i = -e$ or $q_i = Z_i e$ are the charges of either an electron or nucleus, respectively, and $r_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$ is the distance between particles i and j located at the points $\mathbf{r}_i$ and $\mathbf{r}_j$, respectively, from the origin of the laboratory coordinate system. In the coordinate representation $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i = -i\hbar\nabla_i$.

Since the Coulomb potential V is invariant under translations $\hat{U}(\mathbf{a})\mathbf{r}_i\hat{U}(\mathbf{a})^\dagger = \mathbf{r}_i + \mathbf{a}$ ($\hat{U}(\mathbf{a})V\hat{U}(\mathbf{a})^\dagger = V$), then the eigenfunctions of the translation–invariant Hamiltonian operator (1) are not square integrable. For that reason we first separate the motion of the center of mass by means of a linear coordinate transformation

$$\mathbf{r}'_j = \sum_i t_{ji}\mathbf{r}_i \tag{2}$$

that leads to

$$\nabla_j = \sum_i t_{ij}\nabla'_i \tag{3}$$

and

$$\sum_i \frac{1}{m_i}\nabla_i^2 = \sum_i \frac{t_{1i}^2}{m_i}\nabla_1'^2 + 2\sum_i \sum_{j>1} \frac{t_{ji}t_{1i}}{m_i}\nabla'_1\nabla'_j + \sum_i \sum_{j>1} \sum_{k>1} \frac{t_{ji}t_{ki}}{m_i}\nabla'_j\nabla'_k \tag{4}$$

It is our purpose to keep the transformation (2) as general as possible so that it applies to all the nonadiabatic approaches discussed in this review. In order to uncouple one of the new coordinates $\mathbf{r}'_1$ from the remaining ones we require that the coefficients of the transformation (2) satisfy

$$\sum_i \frac{t_{ji}t_{1i}}{m_i} = 0,\ j > 1 \tag{5}$$

The new coordinates transform under translations as follows:

$$\hat{U}(\mathbf{a})\mathbf{r}'_j\hat{U}(\mathbf{a})^\dagger = \mathbf{r}'_j + \mathbf{a}\sum_i t_{ji} \tag{6}$$

If we require that $\mathbf{r}'_1$ transforms exactly as the original variables and that the remaining $\mathbf{r}'_j$ are translation invariant we have

$$\sum_i t_{ji} = \delta_{j1} \tag{7}$$

If we choose $t_{1i} = \xi m_i$, where ξ is an arbitrary real number, then Eq. (5) becomes Eq. (7) for $j > 1$. If we then substitute $t_{1i} = \xi m_i$ into Eq. (7) with $j = 1$ we conclude that

$$t_{1i} = \frac{m_i}{M},\ M = \sum_i m_i \tag{8}$$

and $\mathbf{r}'_1$ results to be the well known coordinate of the center of mass of the molecule [5]. The choice of the coefficients of the transformation (2) for the remaining variables $\mathbf{r}'_j$ $j > 1$ is arbitrary as long as they satisfy Eq. (7).

Finally, the total Hamiltonian operator reads

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}\nabla_1'^2 + \hat{H}_M \\ \hat{H}_M &= -\frac{\hbar^2}{2}\sum_{j>1}\sum_{k>1}\left(\sum_i \frac{t_{ji}t_{ki}}{m_i}\right)\nabla'_j\nabla'_k + \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{N}\frac{q_iq_j}{r_{ij}} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\hat{H}_M$ is the internal or molecular Hamiltonian operator. The explicit form of the interparticle distances r_{ij} in terms of the new coordinates r'_k may be rather cumbersome in the general case. We will consider it in the particular applications discussed in subsequent sections.

For future reference it is convenient to define the center of mass and relative kinetic energy operators

$$\hat{T}_{CM} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}\nabla'^2_1 \tag{10}$$

$$\hat{T}_{rel} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2}\sum_{j>1}\sum_{k>1}\left(\sum_i \frac{t_{ji}t_{ki}}{m_i}\right)\nabla'_j\nabla'_k \tag{11}$$

respectively, so that $\hat{T} = \hat{T}_{CM} + \hat{T}_{rel}$, $\hat{H}_M = \hat{T}_{rel} + V$, and $\hat{H} = \hat{T}_{CM} + \hat{H}_M$.

The inverse transformation $\mathbf{t}^{-1}$ exists and gives us the old coordinates in terms of the new ones:

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \sum_j \left(\mathbf{t}^{-1}\right)_{ij}\mathbf{r}'_j \tag{12}$$

According to equations (6) and (7) we have $\hat{U}(\mathbf{a})\mathbf{r}_i\hat{U}(\mathbf{a})^\dagger = \left(\mathbf{t}^{-1}\right)_{i1}\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{r}_i$ from which we conclude that

$$\left(\mathbf{t}^{-1}\right)_{i1} = 1,\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \tag{13}$$

In order to understand the meaning of this result notice that the momentum conjugate to $\mathbf{r}'_i$ is given by the transformation

$$\hat{\mathbf{p}}'_i = \sum_j \left(\mathbf{t}^{-1}\right)_{ji}\hat{\mathbf{p}}_j \tag{14}$$

so that the linear momentum of the center of mass

$$\hat{\mathbf{p}}'_1 = \sum_j \hat{\mathbf{p}}_j \tag{15}$$

is precisely the total linear momentum of the molecule. We also appreciate that $T_{CM} = \hat{\mathbf{p}}_1'^2/(2M)$ and that he inverse transformation of the momenta is (see Eq. (3))

$$\mathbf{p}_j = \sum_i \mathbf{t}_{ij} \mathbf{p}_i' \tag{16}$$

Eq. (13) is also relevant to the behaviour of the dipole moment in internal coordinates. We have

$$\mu = \sum_i q_i \mathbf{r}_i \tag{17}$$

in the laboratory–fixed frame, and

$$\hat{U}(\mathbf{a}) \mu \hat{U}(\mathbf{a})^\dagger = \mu + q\mathbf{a},\ q = \sum_i q_i \tag{18}$$

clearly shows that μ is invariant under a translation of the origin for a neutral molecule $q = 0$. In internal coordinates we have

$$\mu = \sum_j q_j' \mathbf{r}_j',\ q_j' = \sum_i q_i \left(\mathbf{t}^{-1}\right)_{ij} \tag{19}$$

and $\hat{U}(\mathbf{a}) \mu \hat{U}(\mathbf{a})^\dagger = \mu + q_1' \mathbf{a}$ that is consistent with Eq. (18) because $q_1' = q$ by virtue of Eq. (13).

We have kept the transformation (2) as general as possible in order to have a suitable expression of the molecular Hamiltonian that applies to all the nonadiabatic approaches discussed in this review. In what follows we illustrate some particular ways of determining the remaining transformation coefficients. More precisely, we will choose a point in the molecule as the origin of the new coordinate axis and refer the positions of $N - 1$ particles to it (remember that three coordinates have been reserved for the location of the center of mass).

As an example, consider an arbitrary set of particle labels I and choose

$$\mathbf{r}'_j = \mathbf{r}_j - \frac{1}{M_I}\sum_{i\in I} m_i \mathbf{r}_i,\ j>1,\ M_I = \sum_{i\in I} m_i \tag{20}$$

That is to say:

$$t_{ji} = \delta_{ji} - \frac{m_i}{M_I}\delta_{iI},\ j>1,\ \delta_{iI} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } i \in I \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

These coefficients t_{ji} already satisfy Eq. (7). If I is the set of nuclear labels then we refer the positions $\mathbf{r}'_j$, $j>1$ to the nuclear center of mass. If the set I contains only one nuclear label we refer the positions of the remaining particles to that particular nucleus. Different authors have already chosen one or the other coordinate origin as shown in sections 9 and 10.

If we take into account that

$$\tau_{jk} = \sum_i \frac{t_{ji}t_{ki}}{m_i} = \frac{\delta_{jk}}{m_j} - \frac{1}{M_I}\left(\delta_{kI}+\delta_{jI}\right) + \frac{1}{M_I} \tag{22}$$

then we realize that the transformation (20) uncouples the coordinates of the particles that belong to I from the remaining ones in the kinetic operator:

$$\tau_{jk} = \begin{cases} \frac{\delta_{jk}}{m_j} - \frac{1}{M_I} \text{ if } j,k \in I \\ 0 \text{ if } j \in I \text{ and } k \notin I \text{ or } j \notin I \text{ and } k \in I \\ \frac{\delta_{jk}}{m_j} + \frac{1}{M_I} \text{ if } j,k \notin I \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

The equations derived in this section are sufficiently general to cover all the strategies commonly followed in the separation of the center of mass prior to the solution of the Schrödinger equation for atoms and molecules. Other general expressions for the translation–free internal coordinates have already been discussed by Sutcliffe and Woolley [6–9]. It is a most important topic in the nonadiabatic quantum–mechanical approach to atoms and molecules.

3 Symmetry

In this section we discuss the symmetry of a molecular system that is determined by all the operators that commute with its Hamiltonian. For example, the total Hamiltonian operator commutes with the total linear momentum

$$[\hat{H}, \hat{\mathbf{p}}] = 0, \ \hat{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \hat{\mathbf{p}}_j = \hat{\mathbf{p}}'_1 \tag{24}$$

and also with the total angular momentum

$$[\hat{H}, \hat{\mathbf{J}}] = 0, \ \hat{\mathbf{J}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \hat{\mathbf{J}}_j \tag{25}$$

It follows from equations (12) and (16) that

$$\hat{\mathbf{J}} = \sum_i \hat{\mathbf{r}}_i \times \hat{\mathbf{p}}_i = \sum_i \hat{\mathbf{r}}'_i \times \hat{\mathbf{p}}'_i = \hat{\mathbf{r}}'_1 \times \hat{\mathbf{p}}'_1 + \hat{\mathbf{J}}' \tag{26}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{J}}'$ is the internal or molecular angular momentum. It is clear that

$$[\hat{H}_M, \hat{\mathbf{J}}'] = 0, \ \hat{\mathbf{J}}' = \sum_{i=2}^{N} \hat{\mathbf{r}}'_i \times \hat{\mathbf{p}}'_i \tag{27}$$

The Hamiltonian operator is invariant under permutation of identical particles. We may formally write this symmetry as

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}\hat{H}\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{-1} = \hat{H} \Rightarrow [\hat{H}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}] = 0 \tag{28}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ stands for any permutation of electrons or identical nuclei. Since $\hat{T}_{CM}$ is invariant under permutation of identical particles we conclude that

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}\hat{H}_M\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{-1} = \hat{H}_M \Rightarrow [\hat{H}_M, \hat{\mathcal{P}}] = 0 \tag{29}$$

Besides, the molecular Hamiltonian operator is also invariant under inversion

$$\hat{\Im}\hat{H}_M\hat{\Im}^{-1} \Rightarrow [\hat{H}_M, \hat{\Im}] = 0 \tag{30}$$

where the inversion operator $\hat{\Im}$ produces the transformations $\hat{\Im}\hat{\mathbf{r}}_j\hat{\Im}^{-1} = -\hat{\mathbf{r}}_j$ and $\hat{\Im}\hat{\mathbf{p}}_j\hat{\Im}^{-1} = -\hat{\mathbf{p}}_j$. Also notice that $[\hat{\mathbf{J}}',\hat{\Im}] = 0$, $[\hat{\mathbf{J}}',\hat{\mathcal{P}}] = 0$ and $[\hat{\Im},\hat{\mathcal{P}}] = 0$ so that we can choose a stationary state Ψ to be simultaneous eigenfunction of such set of commuting operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{H}_M\Psi &= E\Psi, \\
\hat{J}'^2\Psi &= \hbar^2 J'(J'+1)\Psi,\ J' = 0, 1, \ldots \\
\hat{J}'_z\Psi &= \hbar M'_J\Psi,\ M'_J = 0, \pm 1, \ldots, \pm J' \\
\hat{\mathcal{P}}\Psi &= \sigma\Psi \\
\hat{\Im}\Psi &= \pm\Psi
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where $\sigma = 1$ or $\sigma = -1$ for identical bosons or fermions, respectively. A somewhat more rigorous discussion of the kinematics and dynamics of molecules was provided, for example, by Wolley [10]. The simplified discussion in this section is sufficient for present purposes.

4 The Hellmann–Feynman theorem

In this section we derive the Hellmann–Feynman theorem for optimized variational wavefunctions because it is most important for the accurate calculation of dipole moments [4, 11].

Consider a trial function Φ and the variational energy W given by

$$W \langle \Phi | \Phi \rangle = \langle \Phi | \hat{H} | \Phi \rangle \tag{32}$$

An arbitrary variation $\delta\Phi$ leads to

$$\delta W \langle \Phi | \, \Phi \rangle = \langle \delta\Phi | \, \hat{H} - W \, | \Phi \rangle + \langle \delta\Phi | \, \hat{H} - W \, | \Phi \rangle^* \tag{33}$$

were the asterisk denotes complex conjugation. The right–hand side of this equation vanishes when $\delta W = 0$; that is to say, when W is stationary with respect to the infinitesimal change $\delta\Phi$ in the trial function. The variational or optimal trial function satisfies this condition.

If the Hamiltonian operator depends on a parameter λ, which may be, for example, a mass, charge, force constant, the strength of a external field, etc., then the variational function will also depend on it. Therefore, differentiation of Eq. (32) with respect to λ leads to

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial \lambda} \langle \Phi | \, \Phi \rangle = \langle \Phi | \, \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial \lambda} \, | \Phi \rangle + \left\langle \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \lambda} \right| \hat{H} - W \, | \Phi \rangle + \left\langle \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \lambda} \right| \hat{H} - W \, | \Phi \rangle^* \tag{34}$$

It is clear from this equation that if the set of variations $\delta\Phi$ includes $(\partial\Phi/\partial\lambda)\,\delta\lambda$ then the optimized trial function Φ will satisfy the well known Hellmann–Feynman theorem [12, 13]:

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial \lambda} = \left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{H}}{\partial \lambda} \right\rangle \tag{35}$$

where $\left\langle \hat{A} \right\rangle = \left\langle \Phi | \hat{A} | \Phi \right\rangle / \langle \Phi | \Phi \rangle$.

5 The Born–Oppenheimer Approximation

Since the vast majority of quantum–mechanical studies of molecular properties are based on the Born–Oppenheimer (BO) approximation [14] we discuss it here with some detail, in spite of the fact that we are more interested in

non BO approaches. Before proceeding we mention the curious fact that the modern and most useful form of that approach appears to have been first developed by Slater [15] in his study of the Helium atom as early as 1927. However, we will adopt the common practice to attribute it to Born and Oppenheimer. In this section we begin with the traditional procedure proposed by Slater [15] and Born and Huang [14] and then mention other authors' approaches and criticisms.

For simplicity and clarity we write the Schrödinger equation for a molecule as

$$\hat{H}\Psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}^e, \mathbf{r}^n) = E_\alpha \Psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}^e, \mathbf{r}^n) \tag{36}$$

where $\mathbf{r}^e$ and $\mathbf{r}^n$ denote all the electronic and nuclear coordinates, respectively, and the subscript α stands for the collection of all the quantum numbers necessary for the description of the molecular state. We use the symbols $\hat{T}_e$, $\hat{T}_n$, V_{ee},V_{ne}, V_{nn} to indicate the kinetic energy operators for the electrons and nuclei, and the electrons–electrons, nuclei–electrons, and nuclei–nuclei Coulomb interactions, respectively:

$$\hat{H} = \hat{T}_n + \hat{H}_e + V_{nn},\ \hat{H}_e = \hat{T}_e + V_{ee} + V_{ne} \tag{37}$$

The BO approximation is based on the ansatz

$$\Psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}^e, \mathbf{r}^n) = \sum_j \chi_{\alpha j}(\mathbf{r}^n)\varphi_j(\mathbf{r}^e, \mathbf{r}^n) \tag{38}$$

and we assume that $\langle \varphi_j \,|\varphi_k\rangle_e = \delta_{jk}$, where the subscript e indicates integration over electronic coordinates. It follows from equations (36), (37) and (38) that

$$\langle \varphi_k |\, \hat{H}\, |\Psi_\alpha\rangle_e = \hat{T}_n \chi_{\alpha k} + \sum_j \left(U_{kj} + W_{kj}\right) \chi_{\alpha j} = E_\alpha \chi_{\alpha k} \tag{39}$$

where

$$U_{kj} = \langle\varphi_k|\,\hat{H}_e\,|\varphi_j\rangle_e + V_{nn}\delta_{kj},\ W_{kj} = \langle\varphi_k|\,[\hat{T}_n,\varphi_j]\Big\rangle_e \tag{40}$$

We have introduced the formal commutator $[\hat{T}_n,\varphi_j]$ with the sole purpose of making the resulting equation more compact.

In the standard BO approximation we choose the functions φ_j to be eigenfunctions of the electronic Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_e$

$$\hat{H}_e\varphi_j(\mathbf{r}^e,\mathbf{r}^n) = E_{ej}(\mathbf{r}^n)\varphi_j(\mathbf{r}^e,\mathbf{r}^n) \tag{41}$$

so that

$$U_{kj}(\mathbf{r}^n) = U_j(\mathbf{r}^n)\delta_{kj},\ U_j(\mathbf{r}^n) = E_{ej}(\mathbf{r}^n) + V_{nn}(\mathbf{r}^n) \tag{42}$$

In the first approximation we assume the couplings W_{kj} between "electronic states" to be small and keep just one term for the ground state

$$\Psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}^e,\mathbf{r}^n) \approx \chi_{\alpha 0}(\mathbf{r}^n)\varphi_0(\mathbf{r}^e,\mathbf{r}^n) \tag{43}$$

and

$$\Big[\hat{T}_n + U_0(\mathbf{r}^n)\Big]\,\chi_{\alpha 0}(\mathbf{r}^n) = E_n^{BO}\chi_{\alpha 0}(\mathbf{r}^n) \tag{44}$$

The addition of the diagonal term W_{00} to the nuclear operator in this equation gives rise to the adiabatic approximation.

Sutcliffe and Wolley have criticized the main assumptions of this approach in several papers [7–10,16]. For example, they pointed out that the functions in the expansion in the right–hand side of Eq. (38) are assumed to be square integrable, whereas the left–hand side is not because we have not removed the motion of the center of mass. Such criticism, which also applies to the approximate and widely used ansatz (43), does not appear to be justified because the nuclear functions $\chi_{\alpha j}$ are not square integrable. According to

those authors another drawback of the BO approximation is that it does not take into account the permutational symmetry of identical nuclei that are treated as distinguishable particles clamped in space in order to define a framework geometry unambiguously. However, in principle we can introduce such permutational symmetry in the approximate wavefunction (43) by means of appropriate projection operators like those mentioned below in Sec. 9. In our opinion the Born–Oppenheimer approximation is a consistent way of deriving a suitable approximate solution to the Schrödinger equation.

It is interesting how some popular good books on quantum chemistry introduce this subject. For example, Szabo and Ostlung [4] state that "Our discussion of this approximation is qualitative. The quantitative aspects of this approximation are clearly discussed by Sutcliffe" and they give a reference and simply write the single product (43). On the other hand, Pilar [17], referring to a Hamiltonian operator like (1), says: "where it is assumed that all nuclear and electronic coordinates have been referred to the center of mass of the system". However, that Hamiltonian operator exhibits all the electronic and nuclear coordinates and no coupling terms coming from the separation of the center of mass. Therefore, it cannot be the internal Hamiltonian operator as we have already seen above. These are just two examples of how most authors blindly accept the clamped nuclei approximation without further analysis.

In some cases, mostly for diatomic molecules, the separation of the motion of the center of mass has been carried out rigorously prior to the application of the BO approximation [12]. Sutcliffe and Woolley have already discussed this issue in detail in several papers [7–10, 16].

Although it is not customary to remove the motion of the center of mass of the whole molecule before the application of the BO approximation, it appears to be common practice to separate the nuclear center of mass at the second stage (44). Since the nuclei are much heavier than the electrons we may assume that the error is small. A rigorous discussion of this issue as well as a simple exactly solvable example are given elsewhere [18, 19].

A most important by–product of the clamped–nuclei approximation is that it enables one to introduce the familiar (classical) chemical concept of molecular structure into the quantum–mechanical calculations. The molecular geometry is given by the equilibrium nuclear configuration $\mathbf{r}^n_{eq}$ at the minimum of $U(\mathbf{r}^n)$:

$$\nabla U(\mathbf{r}^n)\big|_{\mathbf{r}^n=\mathbf{r}^n_{eq}} = 0 \tag{45}$$

At this point it is worth noticing that $U(\mathbf{r}^n)$ would not appear in a straightforward rigorous solution of the Schrödinger equation (36). Sutcliffe and Woolley [6–10, 16, 20] have also pointed out to the difficulty of discussing molecular structure without the BO approximation (or any of its variants).

6 Interaction between a molecule and an external field

In order to make the present review sufficiently self–contained we briefly develop the main equations for the interaction between a molecule and an external potential $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$. The energy of that interaction is given by [21]

$$W = \int \rho(\mathbf{r})\Phi(\mathbf{r})\, d\mathbf{r} \tag{46}$$

where $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is the molecular charge density. If the potential varies slowly in the region where the charge density is nonzero we can expand it in a Taylor series about the coordinate origin located somewhere in the molecule:

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}) = \Phi(0) + \sum_u u \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial u}(0) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_u \sum_v uv \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial u \partial v}(0) + \ldots \tag{47}$$

where $u, v = x, y, z$. Since $\nabla^2 \Phi(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{0}$ we subtract $r^2 \nabla^2 \Phi(0)/6$ from this equation and rewrite the result as

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}) = \Phi(0) + \sum_u u \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial u}(0) + \frac{1}{6} \sum_u \sum_v \left(3uv - r^2 \delta_{uv}\right) \frac{\partial^2 \Phi}{\partial u \partial v}(0) + \ldots \tag{48}$$

If we now take into account that the external field is given by $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}) = -\nabla \Phi(\mathbf{r})$ we have

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}) = \Phi(0) - \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{F}(0) - \frac{1}{6} \sum_u \sum_v \left(3uv - r^2 \delta_{uv}\right) \frac{\partial F_u}{\partial v}(0) + \ldots \tag{49}$$

For a set of point charges q_i located at $\mathbf{r}_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ we have

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i) \tag{50}$$

and the interaction energy becomes

$$W = q\Phi(0) - \mu \cdot \mathbf{F}(0) - \frac{1}{6} \sum_u \sum_v Q_{uv} \frac{\partial F_u}{\partial v}(0) + \ldots \tag{51}$$

where the net charge q, the dipole moment μ, and the quadrupole moment $\mathbf{Q}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} q &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i \\ \mu &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i \mathbf{r}_i \\ Q_{uv} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i \left(3u_i v_i - r_i^2 \delta_{uv}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

If the applied field is uniform in the region of interest, then all the terms beyond the first two ones in the right–hand side of Eq. (51) vanish.

In one of his well known discussions of long–range intermolecular forces Buckingham [22] considers a Hamiltonian operator of the form

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}^0 - \mu \cdot \mathbf{F} - \frac{1}{3} \sum_u \sum_v \Theta_{uv} F_{uv} + \ldots \tag{53}$$

where $\mathbf{\Theta} = \mathbf{Q}/2$ and $F_{uv} = (\partial F_u / \partial v)(0)$. Thus, the perturbation expansion for the energy of the molecule in the external field results to be [22]

$$W = \langle \Psi | \, \hat{H} \, | \Psi \rangle = W^{(0)} - \sum_u \mu_u^{(0)} F_u - \frac{1}{2} \sum_u \sum_v \alpha_{uv} F_u F_v - \ldots - \frac{1}{3} \sum_u \sum_v \Theta_{uv}^{(0)} F_{uv} - \ldots \tag{54}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_u^{(0)} &= \left\langle \Psi^{(0)} \right| \hat{\mu}_u \left| \Psi^{(0)} \right\rangle \\ \Theta_{uv}^{(0)} &= \left\langle \Psi^{(0)} \right| \hat{\Theta}_{uv} \left| \Psi^{(0)} \right\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

are the permanent dipole and quadrupole moments, respectively. Buckingham [22] does not write the Hamiltonian operator $\hat{H}^{(0)}$ explicitly, but he refers to the energy of "separate molecules for fixed molecular positions and orientations". Therefore one may assume that he probably means the BO Hamiltonian operator. On the other hand, Bishop [23] considers that Eq. (54) can be used irrespective of whether one is considering the electronic or the total molecular energy. He explicitly indicates that q_i is an element of charge at the point $\mathbf{r}_i$ relative to an origin fixed at some point in the molecule. As shown below in sections 9 and 10, this choice of reference frame is not convenient for the nonadiabatic calculation of the dipole moment.

In a most interesting and comprehensive review of the electric moments of molecules Buckingham [24] argues, by means of simple and rigorous symmetry arguments, that a diatomic molecule in some stationary states does not possess a dipole moment. We will come back to this point in sections 9 and 10.

7 Experimental Measurements of Dipole Moments

Typical experimental measurements of dipole moments are based on microwave spectra, and almost invariably on the Stark effect and the model of a rigid (or almost rigid) rotating dipole. If $\hat{H}_{rot}$ is the hamiltonian of a rigid rotator and $-\mu \cdot \mathbf{F}$ is the interaction between the molecular dipole moment and the uniform electric field (as shown above in Sec. 6)), then the Stark rotational energies are given by

$$\hat{H}_{rot}(F)\psi^{rot} = E^{rot}(F)\psi^{rot},\ \hat{H}_{rot}(F) = \hat{H}_{rot}(0) - \mu F\cos(\theta) \qquad (56)$$

where θ is the angle between the external field $\mathbf{F}$ and the dipole moment μ.

The external electric field produces both shift and splitting of the molecular rotational energies. The magnitude of the shift of the spectral lines $\tilde{\nu}(F) = \Delta E^{rot}(F)/(hc)$ changes with the field. Rayleigh–Schrödinger perturbation theory provides analytical expressions for the Stark shifts in the form of a power series of the field intensity:

$$\Delta\tilde{\nu}(F) = \tilde{\nu}(F) - \tilde{\nu}(0) = \tilde{\nu}^{(1)}\mu F + \tilde{\nu}^{(2)}(\mu F)^2 + \ldots \qquad (57)$$

where the coefficients $\tilde{\nu}^{(j)}$ are known functions of the rotational quantum numbers [1–3]. If we measure the Stark shifts for known values of the field intensity and then fit selected experimental data to a polynomial function of the field we can obtain the dipole moment from the polynomial coefficients.

In order to account for the hyperfine structure of the spectra one should add the terms arising from the spin–rotational interaction, the quadrupole interaction of the nuclei, and the spin–spin magnetic interactions [1–3].

Molecular beam electric resonance experiments are also based on the same model of rotating dipole [3].

There have been many experimental studies of a wide variety of molecules. We restrict to the simplest ones that are accessible to existing nonadiabatic approaches, such as, obviously, diatomics [25–28]. In this case $\tilde{\nu}^{(1)} = 0$ and the Stark effect is quadratic. It is worth paying attention to the discrepancy in notation and presentation of the empirical models. For example, the model Hamiltonian may be either an actual operator [27] or a scalar function of the quantum numbers [28]. The interaction between the dipole and the field may also be written in somewhat different ways [27, 28] or the effective Hamiltonian may omit the rotational kinetic energy [26].

Although symmetric tops appear to be beyond present nonadiabatic treatments, we quote them here as another example of the use of the model of a rotating dipole outlined above [29,30]. In this case $\tilde{\nu}^{(1)} = 0$ when $K = 0$ and $\tilde{\nu}^{(1)} \neq 0$ when $K \neq 0$, where K is the quantum number for the projection of the angular momentum along the symmetry axis.

It is clear from the discussion above that the accuracy and reliability of the experimental determination of the molecular dipole moment does not

depend only on the accuracy of the measured Stark line shifts but also on the validity of the theoretical, semi–empirical model of the molecule as a rotating electric dipole. We will come back on this important point later in Sec. 11.

8 Born–Oppenheimer Calculations of Dipole Moments

Although we are mainly interested in the nonadiabatic calculation of dipole moments it is worth comparing it with the more popular BO approach to the problem. For this reason, in this section we outline the latter. If we are able to solve Eq. (41) for an appropriate set of nuclear configurations and determine the equilibrium geometry of the molecule given by Eq. (45), we can then calculate the dipole moment as follows:

$$\mu^{BO} = -e \int \varphi(\mathbf{r}^e, \mathbf{r}^n_{eq})^* \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_e} \mathbf{r}^e_j \right) \varphi(\mathbf{r}^e, \mathbf{r}^n_{eq}) \, d\mathbf{r}^e + e \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} Z_j \mathbf{r}^n_{j\,eq} \tag{58}$$

for a molecule with N_e electrons and N_n nuclei [4]. In this equation $d\mathbf{r}^e$ denotes the volume element for all the electronic coordinates.

An alternative approach consists in solving the electronic BO equation for the molecule in an electric field

$$\hat{H}_e(\mathbf{F}) = \hat{H}_e(0) + e\mathbf{F} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{N_e} \mathbf{r}^e_j \tag{59}$$

and then calculate the electronic part of the dipole moment as

$$\mu^e_u = - \left(\frac{\partial E_e(\mathbf{r}^n_{eq}, \mathbf{F})}{\partial F_u} \right)_{F=0} \tag{60}$$

where $E_e(\mathbf{r}^n_{eq}, \mathbf{F})$ is the lowest eigenvalue of the electronic operator (59) for the equilibrium geometry.

Szabo and Ostlund [4] discuss the reasons for the noticeable discrepancy between both approaches. It is known to be due to the fact that approximate wavefunctions which are not well optimized fail to satisfy the Hellmann-Feynman theorem [11] already discussed in Sec. 4. Since the formally correct definition of properties like the dipole moment is as a response function to an external field (see Sec. 6) Swanton et al [11] proposed a calculation based on the following expression

$$\mu^e_u = \langle \Phi(0)| \, \hat{\mu}^e_u \, |\Phi(0)\rangle - 2 \left\langle \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial F_u}(0) \right| [\hat{H}_e(0) - E_e(\mathbf{r}^n_{eq}, 0) \, |\Phi(0)\rangle \qquad (61)$$

in such cases where the variational function is not fully optimized and one does not have appropriate analytical expressions for the derivatives $(\partial E_e/\partial F_u)_{F=0}$. This equation is a particular case of (34) when the electronic approximate wavefunction is real and normalized to unity $\langle \Phi(0)| \, \Phi(0)\rangle = 1$.

The nuclear configuration given by the set of equilibrium coordinates $\mathbf{r}^n_{eq}$ determines what we usually call the geometry of the molecule and thereby the orientation of the dipole moment. For example, we know that the dipole moment is directed along the molecular axis in a linear molecule without an inversion center or along the symmetry axis in a symmetric top. The analysis is not so simple in the case of the nonadiabatic calculations that we will discuss in Sec. 9.

According to Cade and Huo [31] the dipole moment calculated by means of this quantum–mechanical approach for just one internuclear distance (say, the theoretical or experimental R_e) is not strictly comparable to the experimental one that commonly corresponds to a particular vibrational state or

an average over a set of vibrational states. In spite of this apparent deficiency of the BO approach, it is worth noticing that when Wharton et al [25] determined the dipole moment of LiH experimentally to be $\mu = 5.9D$ there were as many as eight previous reliable quantum–mechanical calculations that agreed with it to $\pm 0.3D$ [32].

9 Nonadiabatic Calculations of Dipole Moments

Most theoretical calculations of dipole moments are based on the BO approximation for several reasons: first, and most importantly, non BO calculations require far more computer time, second, most theoretical chemists are unwilling to go beyond the BO approximation that they assume to know well, third, non BO calculations give rise to some additional theoretical difficulties as we will show below. It is therefore not surprising that non BO calculations of dipole moments are scarce and few. We describe some of then in this section and in Sec. 10.

Tachikawa and Osamura [33] proposed a dynamic extended molecular orbital (DEMO) approach based on SCF wavefunctions of the form

$$\Psi^{SCF} = \prod_I \Phi^I \tag{62}$$

where each Φ^I is a function of the coordinates of a set of identical particles with the appropriate permutation symmetry. These functions are expressed in terms of generalized molecular orbitals ϕ_j^I that are linear combinations of

floating Gaussians χ_r^I:

$$\phi_j^I = \sum_r c_{rj}^I \chi_r^I \tag{63}$$

It is worth noticing that Tachikawa and Osamura[TO00] did not separate the motion of the center of mass, and this omission will give rise to considerable errors if the SCF orbitals depend on laboratory–fixed coordinates [34]. Another limitation of this approach is that the SCF wavefunction does not take into account particle correlation that may be quite strong between nuclei [35, 36].

If the variational approach were based on a trial function $\varphi(\mathbf{r}'_2, \mathbf{r}'_3, \ldots, \mathbf{r}'_N)$ of just internal, translation–free, coordinates $\mathbf{r}'_j$ (see Sec. 2), it would not be necessary to separate the motion of the center of mass explicitly because $\langle\varphi|\,\hat{H}\,|\varphi\rangle = \langle\varphi|\,\hat{H}_M\,|\varphi\rangle$. But it is not the case of the SCF wavefunction (62) so that we have $E^{SCF} = \left\langle\Psi^{SCF}\right|\hat{H}\left|\Psi^{SCF}\right\rangle = \left\langle\Psi^{SCF}\right|\hat{T}_{CM}\left|\Psi^{SCF}\right\rangle + \left\langle\Psi^{SCF}\right|\hat{H}_M\left|\Psi^{SCF}\right\rangle > \left\langle\Psi^{SCF}\right|\hat{H}_M\left|\Psi^{SCF}\right\rangle$. Therefore, the estimated energy will always be worse than when the trial function depends only on internal coordinates, even though the SCF wavefunction may satisfy the virial theorem $2\left\langle\Psi^{SCF}\right|\hat{T}\left|\Psi^{SCF}\right\rangle = -\left\langle\Psi^{SCF}\right|V\left|\Psi^{SCF}\right\rangle$ [13, 33]. The reader may find a more detailed discussion of this issue elsewhere [34].

Tachikawa and Osamura [33] calculated the dipole moments of the ^{m}H^{n}H and ^{m}Li^{n}H isotopomer series, but, unfortunately, they did not show the expression that they used. This issue is not a minor one as discussed in what follows.

Before proceeding further, it is convenient to discuss the failure of the naive approach to the nonadiabatic calculation of dipole moments. In quantum mechanics one obtains the average of an observable O as the expectation

value $\langle\Psi|\,\hat{O}\,|\Psi\rangle$ of the corresponding operator $\hat{O}$. In Sec. 3 we showed that $\hat{\Im}\Psi = \pm\Psi$ because the molecular Hamiltonian is invariant under inversion. Since $\hat{\Im}\hat{\mu}\hat{\Im}^{-1} = -\hat{\mu}$ we conclude that

$$\mu = \langle\Psi|\,\hat{\mu}\,|\Psi\rangle = 0 \tag{64}$$

for any nondegenerate molecular state Ψ. This result that is known since long ago [24] applies to *any* molecule in its ground state and renders fruitless the calculation of its dipole moment as a straightforward expectation value in a set of axes parallel to the laboratory one (like the one discussed in Sec. 2).

One of the problems that arises from the separation of the center of mass discussed in Sec. 2 is that the transformation (12) can make the Coulomb potential rather messy. One way of keeping a simple form of the potential–energy function is to choose one of the particles as coordinate origin. From a practical point of view it appears to be convenient to choose the heaviest nucleus for that purpose [35]. Thus, the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}'_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{m_i}{M}\mathbf{r}_i \\ \mathbf{r}'_j &= \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_1,\ j = 2, 3, \ldots, N \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

leads to

$$\hat{H}_M = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2}\sum_i \frac{1}{m_i}\nabla'^2_i - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1}\sum_{j>1}\sum_{k>1}\nabla'_j\nabla'_k + \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0}\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{N}\frac{q_i q_j}{r_{ij}} \tag{66}$$

where m_1 is the mass of the heaviest nucleus and $\mathbf{r}_1$ its location in the laboratory reference frame. The transformed Coulomb potential does not make the calculation of matrix elements unnecessarily complicated as follows from the fact that $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_1| = |\mathbf{r}'_i|$, $i = 2, 3, \ldots, N$ and $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| = |\mathbf{r}'_i - \mathbf{r}'_j|$, $i, j = 2, 3, \ldots, N$.

As an example we consider a four–particle molecule. The transformation (65) is given by the matrix

$$\mathbf{t} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{m_1}{M} & \frac{m_2}{M} & \frac{m_3}{M} & \frac{m_4}{M} \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{67}$$

with inverse

$$\mathbf{t}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{m_2}{M} & -\frac{m_3}{M} & -\frac{m_4}{M} \\ 1 & 1-\frac{m_2}{M} & -\frac{m_3}{M} & -\frac{m_4}{M} \\ 1 & -\frac{m_2}{M} & 1-\frac{m_3}{M} & -\frac{m_4}{M} \\ 1 & -\frac{m_2}{M} & -\frac{m_3}{M} & 1-\frac{m_4}{M} \end{pmatrix} \tag{68}$$

This transformation applies, for example, to the H_2 isotopomer series [37]. The only members that exhibit dipole moments are HD, HT and DT. In this case we choose the labels 1,2,3,4 to denote the heaviest nucleus, the lightest one, and the two electrons, respectively.

The fact that $m_1 > m_2$ gives rise to a charge asymmetry and a small dipole moment. Obviously, the straightforward BO approximation cannot account for it because the electronic Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_e$ does not depend on the nuclear masses (see Sec. 5) and the resulting electronic charge density is exactly the same for all isotopomers. Therefore, in order to obtain the dipole moment of diatomic molecules of the form ${}^m\mathrm{A}^n\mathrm{A}$, one has to take into account nonadiabatic corrections [38–40]. An alternative approach is based on the fact that there is no unique way of implementing the BO approximation. In fact, appropriate canonical transformations of the coordinates prior to the application of the BO approximation may force the required asymmetry and

provide a suitable way of calculating the dipole moment of ${}^{m}\mathrm{A}^{n}\mathrm{A}$ molecules [41, 42].

Cafiero and Adamowicz [35, 37] calculated nonadiabatic dipole moments for some small diatomic molecules; in what follows we outline the variational method proposed by those authors for a diatomic molecule with $N-2$ electrons. The core of the approach is a basis set of floating s–type explicitly correlated Gaussian functions of the form

$$\begin{aligned} g_k(\mathbf{r}) &= \exp\left[-(\mathbf{X}-\mathbf{s}_{kx})\cdot\mathbf{A}_k\cdot(\mathbf{X}-\mathbf{s}_{kx})^t-(\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{s}_{ky})\cdot\mathbf{A}_k\cdot(\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{s}_{ky})^t\right. \\ &\quad \left.-(\mathbf{Z}-\mathbf{s}_{kz})\cdot\mathbf{A}_k\cdot(\mathbf{Z}-\mathbf{s}_{kz})^t\right] \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_k$ is a $N'\times N'$ ($N'=N-1$) symmetric matrix, $\mathbf{X}$, $\mathbf{Y}$, and $\mathbf{Z}$ are $1\times N'$ matrices of the form $\mathbf{X}=(x'_2,x'_3,\ldots,x'_N)$, $\mathbf{s}_k$ is a $1\times N'$ matrix that determines the location of the center of the Gaussian in space and t stands for transpose. In order to assure that the Gaussians are square integrable they chose $\mathbf{A}_k$ to be of Cholesky factored form $\mathbf{A}_k=\mathbf{L}_k\cdot\mathbf{L}_k^t$, where $\mathbf{L}_k$ is a $N'\times N'$ lower triangular matrix.

In order to have the correct permutation symmetry of identical particles they resorted to appropriate projection operators of the form [35]

$$\hat{E}=\prod_i \hat{E}_i \tag{70}$$

and constructed the variational function

$$\Psi=\sum_{k=1}^{m} c_k\hat{E}g_k(\mathbf{r}) \tag{71}$$

so that the permutation of any pair of identical particles leads to either Ψ or $-\Psi$ if they are bosons or fermions, respectively. Then, they minimized the

variational energy

$$E = \min \frac{\langle \Psi | \, \hat{H} \, | \Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi | \, \Psi \rangle} \tag{72}$$

Notice that the matrix $\mathbf{L}_k$ has $N'(N'+1)/2$ independent variational parameters and each $\mathbf{s}_k$ contributes with N'; therefore, there are $N'(N'+1)/2 + 3N' + 1$ adjustable variational parameters for every basis function. In a most comprehensive review Bubin et al [43] discussed this type of calculation in detail.

Since the straightforward expectation value of the dipole–moment operator $\hat{\mu}$ will not produce any physically meaningful result, as discussed above in this section, Cafiero and Adamowicz [35–37] resorted to an alternative approach based on the energy of the molecule in an external electric field $\mathbf{F}$, given by the Hamiltonian operator:

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{F}) = \hat{H}_M - \mathbf{F} \cdot \hat{\mu} \tag{73}$$

They fitted energy values to a polynomial function of the field [35–37]:

$$E(F_z) = E(0) - \mu_z F_z - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{zz} F_z^2 - \ldots \tag{74}$$

and obtained the dipole moment from the linear term. The dipole moments of HD, HT, LiH and LiD calculated in this way proved to be very accurate and in remarkable agreement with available experimental values [35, 37]. In particular, the rate of convergence of the theoretical results for the LiH [35] towards the corresponding experimental dipole moment [26] is astonishing. Table 1 shows some dipole moments calculated by Cafiero and Adamowicz [35,37] and other authors [33,44,45] as well as the corresponding experimental values [26, 46].

However, if the approximate variational function (71) were fully optimized, then it should satisfy the Hellmann–Feynman theorem discussed in Sec. 4 and in that case the only possible result would be

$$\mu_z = \left. \frac{\partial E(F_z)}{\partial F_z} \right|_{F_z=0} = \langle \Psi | \, \hat{\mu}_z \, | \Psi \rangle = 0 \tag{75}$$

The only way that Cafiero and Adamowicz [35, 37] could obtain a nonzero dipole moment by means of this approach is that their variational wavefunction did not become spherically symmetric when $F_z \rightarrow 0$. In other words, that their variational ansatz was not sufficiently accurate at small values of the field strength where it would reveal the permanent molecular dipole moment. In that case, it is not clear how those authors [35, 37] obtained such remarkable agreement between their theoretical results and the experimental values of the dipole moment [26]. A more detailed discussion of this baffling agreement has been published elsewhere [47, 48]. A most speculative explanation is that a biased placement of the centers of the floating Gaussians somehow mimicked the use of a body–fixed set of axes (see Sec. 10). However, the authors never mentioned this possibility. Curiously, in a later paper the authors state that "This spherical symmetry for the ground–state wavefunction implies several things about molecules that may go against common chemical intuition. First of all, no molecule in the ground state will have a dipole moment, just as atoms do not. Similarly, the molecule will have only one unique polarizability, an isotropic polarizability. The current authors have presented several papers which discuss these phenomena" [49]. However, they did not explain how they had obtained the dipole moments in two of those earlier papers [35, 37]. Besides, in Sec. 10 we will show that the statement "no molecule in the ground state will have a dipole moment,

just as atoms do not" is false.

It would be interesting to investigate to which extent the variational ansatz (71) optimized by Cafiero and Adamowicz [35,37] satisfies the Hellmann–Feynman theorem that in the present case gives us an exact theoretical relation between the molecule's response to the field and the dipole moment. Exact relationships like those given by the hypervirial and Hellmann–Feynman theorems are useful to determine the accuracy of approximate wavefunctions [12, 13]. The questionable success of the method devised by those authors is obviously based on the floating nature of the Gaussian functions that one can place conveniently to get the desired result [35, 37]. Notice that Bubin et al [50] resorted to one–center Gaussian functions of the form

$$\phi_k(\mathbf{r}) = r_1^{m_k} \exp\left[-\mathbf{X}\cdot\mathbf{A}_k\cdot\mathbf{X}^t - \mathbf{Y}\cdot\mathbf{A}_k\cdot\mathbf{Y}^t - \mathbf{Z}\cdot\mathbf{A}_k\cdot\mathbf{Z}^t\right] \qquad (76)$$

to determine the charge asymmetry of the rotationless states of the HD molecule. Clearly, this kind of basis functions cannot be placed at will to force an axial symmetry and a nonzero dipole moment. It is for this reason that we mentioned above in this section that it is unfortunate that Tachikawa and Osamura [33] did not show the expression that they used for the calculation of the dipole moment of the ^{m}H^{n}H and ^{m}Li^{n}H molecules.

The nonadiabatic calculations of molecular dipole moments described in this section are bound to fail because they are based on a set of axes parallel to the laboratory one. Therefore, the expectation value of the dipole–moment operator vanishes for any molecule in a nondegenerate state. In Sec. 10 we discuss more judicious calculations based on molecule–fixed coordinate systems.

10 Molecule–Fixed Coordinate System

It is convenient to discuss the motion of a system of particles in space by means of three sets of axes. One set of axis remains fixed somewhere in the laboratory. A second set of axes with its origin fixed on the system center of mass and parallel to the laboratory one. It was discussed in Sec. 2 with the purpose of separating the motion of the entire system as a point particle with mass equal to the total mass of the system. A third set of axes with origin on the center of mass and somehow completely fastened to the system enables us to describe its rotational motion. It is not difficult to define such set of axes for a rigid body, but it is not so obvious when the distance between the system particles change rather arbitrarily. It is clear that we should define any intrinsic molecular property, like the electric dipole moment, moment of inertia, etc, with respect to this body–fixed reference frame. If we use the second set of axes we expect that the expectation value of the dipole–moment operator for the molecule in a nondegenerate state vanishes as discussed in Sec. 9. This result is an obvious consequence of the average over the angular degrees of freedom of the whole system. The proper use of the body–fixed set of axes was clearly addressed by Blinder [38, 39] in his studies on the HD molecule, and Sutcliffe [6–8, 51] discussed the more general case of polyatomic molecules. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to Blinder's proposal for diatomic molecules [38, 39] in what follows.

For generality we first consider a diatomic molecule with the nuclei located at $\mathbf{r}_1$ and $\mathbf{r}_2$ and the electrons at $\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3, \ldots, \mathbf{r}_N$. Following Blinder [38] we use relative coordinates for the nuclei and refer the electron coordinates to the

midpoint between the nuclei according to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}'_1 &= \frac{1}{M}\sum_i m_i \mathbf{r}_i \\ \mathbf{r}'_2 &= \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1 \\ \mathbf{r}'_i &= \mathbf{r}_i - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2),\ i > 2 \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

that is a particular case of Eq. (2) with

$$\begin{aligned} t_{1j} &= \frac{m_j}{M} \\ t_{2j} &= \delta_{j2} - \delta_{j1} \\ t_{ij} &= \delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{j1} + \delta_{j2}),\ j > 2 \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

The resulting molecular Hamiltonian operator in the coordinate representation will be

$$\hat{H}_M = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_s}\nabla'^2_2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_e}\sum_{j=3}^{N}\nabla'^2_j - \frac{\hbar^2}{8m_s}\left(\sum_{j=3}^{N}\nabla'_j\right)^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_a}\nabla'_2\cdot\sum_{j=3}^{N}\nabla'_j + V \tag{79}$$

where m_e is the electronic mass, $m_s = m_1 m_2/(m_1+m_2)$ and $m_a = m_1 m_2/(m_1 - m_2)$. These coordinates are most convenient to calculate the dipole moment of diatomic molecules of the form ${}^m\mathrm{A}^n\mathrm{A}$ because the fourth term in the right–hand side of the internal Hamiltonian (79) vanishes when $m_1 = m_2$ and can therefore be treated as a perturbation that converts the symmetric case to an asymmetric one.

In order to place the molecule–fixed set of axes we take into account the unit vectors generated by

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1 = R(\cos\phi\sin\theta\,\mathbf{e}_x + \sin\phi\sin\theta\,\mathbf{e}_y + \cos\theta\,\mathbf{e}_z) \tag{80}$$

where $\mathbf{e}_x,\ \mathbf{e}_y$ and $\mathbf{e}_z$ are the space–fixed orthonormal Cartesian vectors (second set of axes). Notice that we renamed the vector $\mathbf{r}'_2$ in order to match Blinder's notation [38].

We next define the body–fixed orthonormal vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}'_x &= \frac{\mathbf{e}_\theta}{|\,\mathbf{e}_\theta|},\ \ \mathbf{e}_\theta = \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial \theta} \\ \mathbf{e}'_y &= \frac{\mathbf{e}_\phi}{|\,\mathbf{e}_\phi|},\ \ \mathbf{e}_\phi = \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial \phi} \\ \mathbf{e}'_z &= \mathbf{e}_R,\ \ \mathbf{e}_R = \frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial R} \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

and the new particle coordinates with respect to them

$$\mathbf{r}'_i = x'_i \mathbf{e}_x + y'_i \mathbf{e}_y + z'_i\, \mathbf{e}_z = x''_i \mathbf{e}'_x + y''_i \mathbf{e}'_y + z''_i \mathbf{e}'_z \tag{82}$$

The transformation between these two sets of coordinates

$$\begin{pmatrix} x''_i \\ y''_i \\ z''_i \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{C} \begin{pmatrix} x'_i \\ y'_i \\ z'_i \end{pmatrix} \tag{83}$$

is obviously given by the orthogonal matrix

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}_x \cdot \mathbf{e}'_x & \mathbf{e}_y \cdot \mathbf{e}'_x & \mathbf{e}_z \cdot \mathbf{e}'_x \\ \mathbf{e}_x \cdot \mathbf{e}'_y & \mathbf{e}_y \cdot \mathbf{e}'_y & \mathbf{e}_z \cdot \mathbf{e}'_y \\ \mathbf{e}_x \cdot \mathbf{e}'_z & \mathbf{e}_y \cdot \mathbf{e}'_z & \mathbf{e}_z \cdot \mathbf{e}'_z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\phi\cos\theta & \sin\phi\cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ -\sin\phi & \cos\phi & 0 \\ \cos\phi\sin\theta & \sin\phi\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix} \tag{84}$$

We do not show the explicit form of the Hamiltonian operator in this molecule–fixed reference frame because it is not necessary for the present discussion. Blinder [38] derived it for the HD molecule.

The new nuclear coordinates will be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_1 &= \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2) = -\frac{\mathbf{R}}{2} = \left(0, 0, -\frac{R}{2}\right) \\ \mathbf{R}_2 &= \mathbf{r}_2 - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{\mathbf{R}}{2} = \left(0, 0, \frac{R}{2}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

and the electronic ones are simply given by $\mathbf{r}''_i$, $i > 2$. Assuming that both nuclei have identical charges then the classical dipole moment in the body–fixed set of axes is given by a purely electronic contribution

$$\mu'' = -e \sum_{i=3}^{N} \mathbf{r}''_i \tag{86}$$

For the particular case of HD ($N = 4$) the expressions above agree with those developed by Blinder [38], except for the different notation and labelling of nuclear and electronic coordinates. They allow one to calculate the dipole moment as the expectation value of the corresponding operator by means of an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian operator in the molecule–fixed set of axes.

The effect of the inversion operator on the rotation angles is given by $\theta \to \pi - \theta$ and $\phi \to \phi + \pi$. Therefore, the first row of the matrix $\mathbf{C}$ remains unchanged and the other two ones change sign. For that reason the inversion operation $(x'_i, y'_i, z'_i) \to (-x'_i, -y'_i, -z'_i)$ in the laboratory–fixed frame results in $(x''_i, y''_i, z''_i) \to (-x''_i, y''_i, z''_i)$ in the body–fixed one, and, consequently, we do not expect that $\langle \hat{\mu}''_z \rangle$ vanishes because of inversion symmetry. However, in the case of identical nuclei $m_1 = m_2$ we cannot have a net dipole moment along the internuclear axis because the additional permutational symmetry leads to $\langle \hat{\mu}''_z \rangle = 0$. In order to explain the occurrence of a dipole moment in a diatomic molecule of the form ${}^m\mathrm{A}^n\mathrm{A}$ we resort to perturbation theory and

write $\hat{H}_M = \hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{H}'$, where

$$\hat{H}_0 = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_s}\nabla_2'^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_e}\left(\nabla_3'^2 + \nabla_4'^2\right) - \frac{\hbar^2}{8m_s}\left(\nabla_3' + \nabla_4'\right)^2 + V \qquad (87)$$

$\lambda = m_s/m_a$ and

$$\hat{H}' = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_s}\nabla_2' \cdot (\nabla_3' + \nabla_4') \qquad (88)$$

Notice that $\hat{H}_0$ is the molecular Hamiltonian for identical nuclei, as follows from the fact that $\lambda = 0$ when $m_1 = m_2$.

We can thus expand the eigenfunction in a λ–power series $\Psi = \Psi^{(0)} + \Psi^{(1)}\lambda \ldots$ that leads to a similar expansion for the dipole moment $\mu_z = \mu_z^{(1)}\lambda + \ldots$ where

$$\mu_z^{(1)} = 2\left\langle \Psi^{(0)} \right| \hat{\mu}_z'' \left| \Psi^{(1)} \right\rangle \qquad (89)$$

provided that the eigenfunction is chosen to be real. This simple argument shows how the different nuclear masses produce a charge asymmetry and a net dipole moment.

Blinder [38] estimated the dipole moment of HD by means of a rather more complicated perturbation approach and later Kolos and Wolniewicz [44, 52] and Wolniewicz [53, 54] improved Blinder's calculation by means of a variational–perturbation method based on Eq. 89.

It is clear that any rigorous nonadiabatic calculation of the molecular dipole moment should be carried out in the molecule–fixed set of axes. Consequently, those approaches outlined above in Sec. 9 are unconvincing (to say the least). Cafiero and Adamowicz [35, 37] must have placed the floating Gaussians in a convenient way to obtain nonzero dipole moments in good agreement with the experimental ones and Tachikawa and Osamura [33] did

not explain how they obtained their results. Besides, the latter authors even forgot to remove the motion of the center of mass.

11 Perturbation theory for the Stark Shift

As we outline above in Sec. 7, the experimental determination of the molecular dipole moment relies on the validity of the model of a rotating quasi–rigid polar body. The procedure consists of fitting a polynomial function of the field strength to the observed Stark–shift lines. In principle, we should derive more rigorous theoretical expressions for those line shifts by means of perturbation theory and the actual quantum–mechanical Hamiltonian operator for a molecule in an electric field.

Instead of the rigid rotator model we should choose $\hat{H}_0 = \hat{H}_M$ the Hamiltonian operator for the isolated molecule and the perturbation $\hat{H}' = -\mathbf{F}.\hat{\mu}$. If we set $\mathbf{F}$ along the z axis in the laboratory frame ($\mathbf{F} = F\mathbf{e}_z$), then $\hat{H}' = -F\hat{\mu}_z$. In this way, perturbation theory gives us the well–known quantum–mechanical expressions for the Stark shifts

$$E_n = E_n^{(0)} + E_n^{(1)} + E_n^{(2)} + \ldots \tag{90}$$

where n is a collection of quantum numbers that completely specifies a given (nonadiabatic) molecular state. For the ground state we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_0^{(1)} &= -\left\langle \Psi_0^{(0)} \right| \hat{\mu}_z \left| \Psi_0^{(0)} \right\rangle F = 0 \\ E_0^{(2)} &= F^2 \sum_{m>0} \frac{\left| \left\langle \Psi_0^{(0)} \right| \hat{\mu}_z \left| \Psi_m^{(0)} \right\rangle \right|^2}{E_0^{(0)} - E_m^{(0)}} \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

where we clearly appreciate that the field–reduced splitting $\Delta E/F^2$ does not give us what we may call the square of the dipole moment but a kind of energy–weighted average over those molecular states with nonzero matrix element $\left\langle \Psi_0^{(0)} \right| \hat{\mu}_z \left| \Psi_m^{(0)} \right\rangle$, including the continuum part of the spectrum. This important issue was already discussed by Brieger et al [55] and Brieger [56] more than twenty years ago in their BO study of the Stark effect of heteronuclear diatomic molecules in $^1\Sigma$ states.

In the molecule–fixed reference frame we have

$$\mu = \mu'_x \mathbf{e}'_x + \mu'_y \mathbf{e}'_y + \mu'_z \mathbf{e}'_z \tag{92}$$

and a similar expression for $\mathbf{F}$. Brieger [56] argued that the spherical vector components

$$\begin{aligned} u'_0 &= u'_z \\ u'_{\pm 1} &= \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (u'_x \pm u'_y) \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

are more convenient for the calculation of the matrix elements in Eq. (91). It is not difficult to prove that

$$\mu.\mathbf{F} = \sum_p (-1)^p \mu'_p F'_p \tag{94}$$

However, since the laboratory–fixed and molecule–fixed are the natural frames for the external field and the molecule, respectively, then Brieger [56] chose $\mathbf{F} = F\mathbf{e}_z$ in the former and μ in the latter as in Eq. (92). Thus, in the simple notation of Sec. 10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_z &= \mu'_x \mathbf{e}_z \cdot \mathbf{e}'_x + \mu'_y \mathbf{e}_z \cdot \mathbf{e}'_y + \mu'_z \mathbf{e}_z \cdot \mathbf{e}'_z = \\ &= -\sin\theta\, \mu'_x + \cos\theta\, \mu'_z = \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\mu'_{+1} - \mu'_{-1} \right) + \cos\theta\, \mu'_0 \end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

In this way, Brieger [56] showed that the perturbation $\hat{H}'$ connects the ground electronic state $^1\Sigma$ with excited $^1\Sigma$ and $^1\Pi$ ones (in general, those with electronic angular–momentum quantum numbers Λ and $\Lambda \pm 1$). Under the BO approximation Brieger et al [55] and Brieger [56] separated the Stark shift (91) into four contributions: (I) coupling of rotational states within the same $^1\Sigma$ vibronic one, (II) coupling of vibrorotational states within the same $^1\Sigma$ electronic state, (III) coupling of vibrorotational states between two $^1\Sigma$ electronic ones, and (IV) coupling of vibrorotational states between the given $^1\Sigma$ and $^1\Pi$ ones. The first three contributions are due to μ_0 and the fourth one to $\mu_{\pm 1}$ [55, 56].

As far as we know there is no nonadiabatic calculation of the Stark shift by means of equation (91). A straightforward comparison of BO and non BO calculations may lead to some difficulties as mentioned by Wolniewicz [54]: "Since the familiar classification of electronic states of diatomic molecules is based on the Born–Oppenheimer approximation, some difficulties arise if one tries to use the standard nomenclature to describe nonadiabatic functions"

12 Conclusions

As said above the nonadiabatic calculations of dipole moments are scarce and few. Those of Tachikawa and Osamura [33] and Cafiero and Adamowicz [35,37] are not reliable because they are not based on the molecule–fixed Hamiltonian operator. In our opinion the only serious attempts to the nonadiabatic calculation of dipole moments are those of Blinder [38, 39], Kolos and Wolniewicz [44,52] and Wolniewicz [53,54]. All the other calculations of

dipole moments are based on the BO approximation.

We have also seen that the comparison between theoretical and experimental dipole moments is not straightforward. The field–reduced line splittings do not give us the square of the molecular dipole moment, as predicted by the oversimplified rigid–rotor model, but a kind of energy–weighted average. Therefore, there is much to be done in this field and we hope that the present discussion will contribute to motivate such work.

References

[1] Gordy W., Smith W. V., and Trambarulo R. F. (1953) *Microwave Spectroscopy*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

[2] Townes C. H. and Schawlow A. L. (1955) *Microwave Spectroscopy*, McGraw-Hill, New York.

[3] Ramsey N. F. (1956) *Molecular Beams*, Oxford University Press, London.

[4] Szabo A. and Ostlund N. S. (1996) *Modern Quantum Chemitrsy*, Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, New York.

[5] Margenau H. and Murphy G. M. (1946) *The Mathematics of Physics and Chemistry*, Van Nostrand, New York.

[6] Sutcliffe B. T. (1992) The Concept of Molecular Structure, in *Theoretical Models of Chemical Bonding. Part 1: Atomic Hypotesis and the Concept of Molecular Structure*, (eds Z. B. Maksic), Springer-Verlag,

Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, London, Paris, Tokyo, Hong Kong, 1992, pp. 1-28.

[7] Sutcliffe B. T. (1993) The coupling of nuclear and electronic motions in molecules. *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.*, **89** (4), 2321-2335.

[8] Sutcliffe B. T. (1994) The Decoupling of Nuclear from Electronic Motions in Molecules, in *Conceptual Trends in Quantum Chemistry*, (eds E. S. Kryachko and J. L. Calais), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1994, pp. 53-85.

[9] Sutcliffe B. T. and Woolley R. G. (2005) Molecular structure calculations without clamping the nuclei. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, **7** (21), 3664-3676.

[10] Woolley R. G. (1991) Quantum chemistry beyond the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. *J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem)*, **230** 17-46.

[11] Swanton D. J., Bacskay G. B., and Hush N. S. (1986) The infrared absorption intensities of the water molecule: a quantum chemical study. *J. Chem. Phys*, **84** (10), 5715-5727.

[12] Hirschfelder J. O. and Meath W. J. (1967) The Nature of Intermolecular Forces, in *Intermolecular Forces*, (eds J. O. Hirschfelder), John Wiley & Sons, New York London Sidney, 1967, pp. 107-142.

[13] Fernández F. M. and Castro E. A. (1987) *Hypervirial theorems*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, London, Paris, Tokyo.

[14] Born M. and Huang K. (1954) *Dynamical Theory of Crystal Lattices*, Oxford University Press, New York.

[15] Slater J. C. (1927) The Structure of the Helium Atom. I. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **13** (6) 423-430.

[16] Woolley R. G. and Sutcliffe B. T. (1977) Molecular structure and the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **45** (2), 393-398.

[17] Pilar F. L. (1968) *Elementary Quantum Chemistry*, McGraw-Hill, New York.

[18] Kutzelnigg W. (1997) The Adiabatic Approximation. I. The Physical Background of the Born-Handy Ansatz. *Molec. Phys.*, **90** (6), 909-916.

[19] Fernández F. M., Born-Oppenheimer Approximation for a Harmonic Molecule, arXiv: 0810.2210v1 [math-ph]

[20] Sutcliffe B. T. and Woolley R. G. (2005) Comment on 'Molecular structure in non-Born-Oppenheimer quantum mechanics'. *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **408** (4-6), 445-447.

[21] Jackson J. D. (1990) *Classical Electrodynamics*, John Wiley & Sons, Singapore.

[22] Buckingham A. D. (1967) Permanent and Induced Molecular Moments and Long-Range Intermolecular Forces, in *Intermolecular Forces*, (eds J. O. Hirschfelder), John Wiley & Sons, New York, London, Sidney, 1967, pp. 107-142.

[23] Bishop D. M. (1990) Molecular vibrational and rotational motion in static and dynamic electric fields. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **62** (2), 343-374.

[24] Buckingham A. D. (1970) Electric Moments of Molecules, in *Physical Chemistry: an Advanced Treatise*, (eds D. Henderson), Academic Press, New York London, 1970, pp. 249-386.

[25] Wharton L., Gold L. P., and Klemperer W. (1960) Dipole moment of Lithium Hydride. *J. Chem. Phys*, **33** (4) 1255.

[26] Wharton L., Gold L. P., and Klemperer W. (1962) Preliminary values of some molecular constants of lithium hydride. *J. Chem. Phys*, **37** (9), 2149.

[27] Rothstein E. (1969) Molecular constants of Lithium hydrides by the molecular-beam electric resonance method. *J. Chem. Phys*, **50** (4) 1899-1900.

[28] Muenter J. S. and Klemperer W. (1970) Hyperfine structure constants of HF and DF. *J. Chem. Phys*, **52** (12), 6033-6037.

[29] Larkin D. M. and Gordy W. (1963) Stark effect and dipole moment of methyl fluoride. *J. Chem. Phys*, **38** (10), 2329-2333.

[30] Steiner P. A. and Gordy W. (1966) Precision measurement of dipole moments and other spectral constants of normal and deuterated methyl fluoride and methyl cyanide. *J. Mol. Spectr.*, **21** (1-4) 291-301.

[31] Cade P. E. and Huo W. M. (1966) Electric dipole moment for first- and second-row diatomic hydride molecules, AH. *J. Chem. Phys*, **45** (3) 1063-1065.

[32] Matsen F. A. (1960) Dipole moment of Lithium Hydride. *J. Chem. Phys*, **34** (1) 337-338.

[33] Tachikawa M. and Osamura Y. (2000) Isotope effect of hydrogen and lithium hydride molecules. Application of the dynamic extended molecular orbital method and energy component analysis. *Theor. Chem. Acc.*, **104** (1), 29-39.

[34] Fernández F. M., On nonadiabatic SCF calculations of molecular properties, arXiv:0908.0009.

[35] Cafiero M. and Adamowicz L. (2002) Nonadiabatic Calculations of the Dipole Moments of LiH and LiD. *Phys. Rev. Lett*, **88** (3), 033002.

[36] Cafiero M., Adamowicz L., Duran M., and Luis J. M. (2003) Nonadiabatic and Born-Oppenheimer calculations of the polarizabilites of LiH and LiD. *J. Mol. Struct.*, **633** (2-3), 113-122.

[37] Cafiero M. and Adamowicz L. (2002) Non-Born-Oppenheimer Isotope Effects on the Polarizabilities of H2. *Phys. Rev. Lett*, **89** (7), 073001.

[38] Blinder S. M. (1960) Dipole moment of HD. *J. Chem. Phys*, **32** (1), 105-110.

[39] Blinder S. M. (1961) Dipole moment of HD. II. *J. Chem. Phys*, **35** (3), 974-981.

[40] Ford A. L. and Browne J. C. (1977) Ab initio calculation of the line strengths in the electric dipole vibration-rotation spectrum of the HD molecule. *Phys. Rev. A*, **16** (5), 1992-2001.

[41] Thorson W. R., Choi J. H., and Knudson S. K. (1985) Novel theory of the HD dipole moment. I. Theory. *Phys. Rev. A*, **31** (1), 22-33.

[42] Thorson W. R., Choi J. H., and Knudson S. K. (1985) Novel theory of the HD dipole moment. II. Computations. *Phys. Rev. A*, **31** (1), 34-42

[43] Bubin S., Cafiero M., and Adamowicz L. (2005) Non-Born-Oppenheimer variational calculations of atoms and molecules with explicitly correlated Gaussian basis functions. *Adv. Chem. Phys.*, **131** 377-475.

[44] Kolos W. and Wolniewicz L. (1966) Vibronic energy and dipole moment of HD. *J. Chem. Phys*, **45** (3), 944-946.

[45] Papadopoulos M. G., Willets A., Handy N. C., and Underhill A. E. (1996) The static polarizabilities and hyperpolarizabilities of LiH: electronic and vibrational contributions. *Molec. Phys.*, **88** (4), 1063-1075.

[46] Lovas F. J. and Tiemann E. (1974) Microwave spectral tables. I. Diatomic molecules. *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data*, **3** (3), 609-769.

[47] Fernández F. M., On nonadiabatic calculation of dipole moments, arXiv:0808.3714v4 [math-ph]

[48] Fernández F. M. (2009) On nonadiabatic calculation of dipole moments. *J. Chem. Phys*, **130** (16), 166101 (3 pp.).

[49] Cafiero M. and Adamowicz L. (2004) Molecular structure in non-Born-Oppenheimer quantum mechanics. *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **387** (1-3) 136-141.

[50] Bubin S., Leonarski F., Stanke M., and Adamowicz L. (2009) Charge asymmetry in pure vibrational states of the HD molecule. *J. Chem. Phys*, **130** (12), 124120 (6 pp.).

[51] Sutcliffe B. T. (1999) The Born-Oppenheimer correction terms for a triatomic system in the Sutcliffe-Tennyson formulation. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, **74** (2), 109-121.

[52] Kolos W. and Wolniewicz L. (1963) Nonadiabatic theory for diatomic molecules and its application to the hydrogen molecule. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **55** (3), 473-483.

[53] Wolniewicz L. (1975) On the computation of dipole Transitions in the HD molecule. *Can. J. Phys.*, **53** (13), 1207-1214.

[54] Wolniewicz L. (1976) On the computation of dipole transitions in the HD molecule. Part II. *Can. J. Phys.*, **54** (6), 672-679.

[55] Brieger M., Renn A., Sodiek A., and Hese A. (1983) The dipole moment of 7LiH and 7LiD in the excited A1S+ state: a test of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. *Chem. Phys.*, **75** (1), 1-9.

[56] Brieger M. (1984) Stark effect, polarizabilities and the electric dipole moment of heteronuclear diatomic molecules in 1S states. *Chem. Phys.*, **89** (2), 275-295.

Table 1: Dipole moments for some diatomic molecules

Ref.	μ (D)	Method
	LiH	
[35]	5.8816	non BO
[45]	5.879	BO
[33]	6.072	non BO
[46]	5.8820 (4)	Exp.
[26]	5.882 ± 0.003	Exp.
	LiD	
[35]	5.8684	non BO
[33]	6.080	non BO
[46]	5.8677 (5)	Exp.
[26]	5.868 ± 0.003	Exp.
	HD	
[44]	1.54×10^{-3}	non BO
[37]	0.831×10^{-3}	non BO
	HT	
[37]	1.111×10^{-3}	non BO
	DT	
[37]	2.77×10^{-4}	non BO